

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 8, 11-20 and 22 have been withdrawn from consideration. By this response, claim 1 is amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejects claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated Murakami (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,441). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that the features of applicants' claimed invention as recited in independent claims 1 and 5 are disclosed within Murakami. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The present invention provides a means by which a metal foil may be used as an electromagnetic shield while also providing a means by which the metal foil is securely fastened. This is accomplished by providing a protrusion at the edge of the metal foil which creates a secure fit between the metal plate and the metal foil.

In this respect, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a metal foil and a metal plate that are connected to each other, wherein at a connecting portion of the metal foil and the metal plate, a protrusion, formed by deforming the metal foil along an edge of the metal foil, is fitted into a hole formed along an edge of the metal plate, such that the metal foil and metal plate are in contact with each other.

The Examiner has not met this burden under 35 U.S.C. §102 of showing that each and every claimed limitation is provided within Murakami. In regard to the features of the claims, the Examiner asserts that the metal plate is provided by the chassis (2) of Murakami. Applicants respectfully disagree. The chassis of Murakami is made of plastic and not metal. See column 3, lines 43 through 46. Further, the Examiner alleges that the tongue (8) of Murakami corresponds to the protrusion found on the edge of the metal foil and fitted into a hole found along an edge of the metal plate. As illustrated above, the metal plate is not provided by Murakami.

Moreover, the tongue of Murakami is not fitted into a hole such that the metal foil and metal plate are in contact with each other. The tongue of Murakami only makes contact with an edge of a chassis, if at all. Therefore, Murakami does not teach each and every aspect of the claimed invention as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, a metal foil and a metal plate that are connected to each other, wherein: at a connection portion of the metal foil and the metal plate, a protrusion, formed by deforming the metal foil, is formed on the metal, and at a position apart from the protrusion in the connecting portion, the metal foil and the metal plate are fastened to each other with a screw so that the protrusion is pressed toward the metal plate.

Again, the Examiner has failed to meet his burden required under 35 U.S.C §102. First, Murakami fails to disclose the use of a metal plate, as discussed above. Second, even if the chassis (2) of Murakami could be considered a metal plate, which applicants submit it can not, Murakami, does not provide the fastening of the metal plate and metal foil using a screw so that the protrusion on the metal foil is "pressed toward the metal plate" as recited in claim 5.

Fig. 7 of Murakami shows the end portion (8a) of a tongue (8) pressed against the circuit board, while a protrusion (30b) of a shield (30a) is touching the other side of the circuit board. The end portion (8a) of the tongue does not come in contact with the chassis. Thus, even if the chassis could be considered as a metal plate, which it can not, the end portion (8a), alleged by the Examiner to correspond to applicants claimed protrusion, of the tongue (8) never touches the chassis.

Thus, in view of the above, Murakami fails to teach each and every aspect of the claimed invention as recited in claim 5. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Further, claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 21 which depend from claims 1 and 5, are likewise distinguishable over the cited reference for at least the reasons above as well as for additional features they recite.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 21 are distinguishable over the cited reference. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is necessary in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's representative at the number listed below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: 

Michael K. Mutter
Reg. No. 29,680

MKM/CJB:cb
2257-0194P

P.O. Box 747
(703) 205-8000
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

MARKED-UP VERSION TO SHOW CHANGES BEING MADE

IN THE CLAIMS:

Claim 1. (Amended)

An electronic device which comprises an electromagnetic shield, said electromagnetic shield comprising:

a metal foil and a metal plate that are connected to each other,

wherein at a connecting portion of said metal foil and said metal plate, a protrusion, formed by deforming said metal foil along an edge of said metal foil, is fitted into a hole formed along an edge of said metal plate, such that the metal foil and metal plate are in contact with each.